

Mr. George Thomson

General Delivery
Fort Albany, Ontario
POL 1H0

(PERSONAL MAIL)

18 July 1994

Dear Mr. Thomson,

Sir! Three years after your 1985 report on environmental sensitivities, on the occasion of releasing the SARC report, you wrote, saying:

"I remain very disappointed with the response to the report on environmental hypersensitivity."

"I told the press last week that I release this report with some trepidation because of what was done with my earlier report."

"I remain convinced that our recommendations make sense and would do much to diffuse the adversarial atmosphere that makes things worse rather than better for patients."

"I have been as vocal as I can be about the need to implement the report, including being available for any public discussions of the issue and meeting with the Minister of Health, the Deputy Minister and other people within the Health Ministry."

"I too have been concerned that we have put extensive effort into a new report for the Government at a time then the recommendations of the earlier report I was involved in have generally not been acted on."

"That I am now part of a second report for government in no way diminishes my concern in this area."

Your 1985 report on disorders causing environmental sensitivities, prepared with five physicians, stated that the position "all the identified patients are emotionally ill" is "clearly untenable".

1. What disappointed you about the Health Ministry's response to the report on environmental sensitivities?

2. What was disquieting about what was done with your earlier report?

3. How was the Ministry of Health's failure to diffuse the adversarial atmosphere making things worse for persons with sensitivities, say, in Ministry of Health facilities?

4. What is your best guess as to why the Ministry of Health, unlike other Ministries, has yet to implement the recommendations which specifically addressed discriminatory, abusive, and damaging attitudes, policies, and actions - even nine years later?

5. Are you concerned that recommendations addressing attitudes (public health education, retraining for doctors) and the critical scientific prerequisite (an environmental control unit to evaluate diagnostic protocols) have still not been acted on?

6. Does the fact that you are now Deputy Attorney General in any way diminish your concern?

7. What legal consequences arise from the fact that the de facto and expressed position of the Ministry of Health, which caused and causes damages, remains "clearly untenable" some years after your report?

Thanks again for your report and your letter. Please break the silence.

Chris Brown